



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,137	02/11/2000	Joseph H. Matthews	2310	6139

7590 12/04/2002

MICHALIK & WYLIE P L L C
14645 Bel-Red Road
Suite 103
Bellevue, WA 98007

EXAMINER

MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,137

Applicant(s)

MATTHEWS ET AL.

Examiner

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) ^{1-52, 56 and 59-68} A is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52, 56 and 59-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Election/Amendment A, filed 9/17/2002.
2. Claims 1-71 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 18, 21, 27, 29, 47, 56, 59 and 68 are independent claims. In the Election/Amendment A, claims 53-55, 57-58 and 69-71 were cancelled. This action is made Non-Final.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Applicant needs to reduce the length of the abstract.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-10, 14-33, 35-41, 46-52 and 59-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Straub et al. ("Straub", US 5,905,492).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claims 1 and 4, Straub teaches in a computer system having a graphical user interface and a user interface selection device, a method of providing and selecting from the user interface, comprising:

maintaining file association information about executable code (col.5, lines 43-46;
inherent in order for operating system to know which program/file to run);

providing a shell user interface having a plurality of pages (col.4, lines 1-2);

displaying on a particular page in the shell user interface, a link associated with an executable code according to the information (col.12, lines 4-5);

receiving a signal indicative of a selection of the link via the user interface and taking action with respect to the executable code in response to the signal (col.1, lines 63-64).

As per claim 2, Straub teaches the link to be associated with a document produced by the executable code (col.1, lines 54-57).

As per claim 3, Straub teaches the action to comprise opening the document in the executable code (col.1, lines 54-57).

Claim 5 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 6, Straub teaches the link to be associated with a link to a web location (col.12, lines 32-33).

As per claim 7, Straub teaches the link to a web location to be displayed on the particular page in accordance with a query to a remote location (col.12, lines 37-39; *server is queried for associated links to be displayed*).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 8, Straub teaches the content corresponding to the link to a web location to be stored locally making the content available for display when the computer system is not connected to the remote source (col.12, lines 21-23).

As per claim 9, Straub teaches the executable code to comprise network access software, and wherein taking action comprises accessing the web location with the network access software (col.12, lines 32-34).

Claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, Straub teaches the method wherein taking action comprises starting operation of a task available to an application program (col.5, lines 43-44; col.12, line 5).

As per claim 15, Straub teaches the shell user interface to comprise a first page and a second page, and further comprising:

displaying on the first page a link associated with the second page and in response to a signal via the user interface indicative if a selection of the link associated with the second page, displaying the second page (col.15, lines 38-45).

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18-20 are individually similar in scope to claim 15 in that they are simply repetitive steps of claim 15, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21-22 are similar in scope to claim 14, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 23-24 are similar in scope to the combination of claims 14-15, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

The limitations of claim 27 are similar in scope to claim 14 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale. In addition Straub teaches grouping a set of the tasks (fig.6, *Folder Content Icons Pane*).

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 27, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 29-31, Straub teaches in a computer system having a graphical user interface and a user interface selection device, a method of providing and selecting from the user interface, comprising:

- maintaining information about links to web locations (col.15, lines 9-14);

- maintaining information about locally-stored files (col.15, lines 34-42);

- displaying on a first page, according to the information about the locally-stored files, a file link for each of the locally-stored files that are grouped together (fig.7, *folder content icons pane*);

- displaying on the first page, according to the information about the links to web locations, a web link for each of the links to web locations that are grouped together (fig.7, *hypertext page pane 190*); and

- in response to a signal indicative of a selection of one of the file links via the user interface, taking action with respect to the locally-stored file associated with the file link (col.15, lines 39-43); and

in response to a signal indicative of a selection of one of the web links via the user interface, taking action with respect to the web location associated with the web link (col.15, lines 12-15).

As per claim 32, Straub teaches the locally-stored file associated with the file link to comprise executable code (col.1, lines 54-57; *inherent in order for operating system to know which program/file to run*).

As per claim 33, Straub teaches the method wherein taking action with respect to the locally-stored file associated with the file link to comprise launching an instance of the executable code (col.1, lines 54-57).

As per claim 35, Straub teaches the locally-stored file associated with the file link to comprise a document (col.1, lines 54-57).

As per claim 36, Straub teaches the method wherein taking action with respect to the locally-stored file associated with the file link to comprise displaying the document (col.1, lines 54-57).

Claim 37 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 27, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 39 is similar in scope to claim 37, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 40 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 41 is similar in scope to claim 23, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 46 is similar in scope to claim 29, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 47, Straub teaches in a computer system having a graphical user interface and a user interface selection device, a method of providing and selecting from the user interface, comprising:

maintaining information about executable code (col.5, lines 43-46; *inherent in order for operating system to know which program/file to run*);

maintaining information about files, the information including at least one item of information about each file (col.1, lines 54-57);

displaying on a first page, a tile having a item link and at least one file link, the file link being associated with a particular item of information about a file, and the item link being associated with at least one executable code according to the information about executable codes (fig.5, *desktop icons pane*; col.12, lines 4-5);

in response to a signal indicative of a selection of the file link via the user interface, taking action with respect to the executable code associated with the file that is associated with the file link (col.1, lines 63-65); and

in response to a signal indicative of a selection of the item link via the user interface, taking action with respect to item associated with the item link (col.1, lines 63-65).

Claim 48 is similar in scope to claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 49 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 50, Straub teaches the file to comprise a program (col.1, line 54).

As per claim 51, Straub teaches the item to comprise a task available within the program. (col.5, lines 43-44; col.12, line 5).

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 52 is similar in scope to claim 47, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 59-61 are individually similar in scope to claims 1-3 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 62, Straub teaches the method wherein taking action comprises creating the document (col.1, lines 63-64).

Claim 63 is similar in scope to claim 62, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 64, Straub teaches associating information to comprise associating metadata with the document (col.1, lines 54-56; *inherent that document include metadata such as the size/pathname of the document in order to distinguish it from other documents*).

Claim 65 is similar in scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 66 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 67 is similar in scope to claim 65, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 68 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. ("Straub", US 5,905,492) in view of Ojala (US 6,222,638).

As per claims 11-12, Straub teaches displaying links associated with programs and services (col.12, lines 4-6) and suggests that the links may be associated with a device (col.11;

Art Unit: 2174

Table 1, Printers). However, Straub does not explicitly disclose the link to be associated with an external device. Ojala teaches a method of displaying a link to an external device wherein taking action comprises displaying a page including settings of the external device (col.1, lines 18-22). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ojala's teaching with Straub's method in order to provide quicker and easier access to devices for performing operations.

As per claim 13, Straub teaches the method wherein taking action comprises starting operation of a task available to an application program (col.5, lines 43-44; col.12, line 5).

8. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. ("Straub", US 5,905,492).

As per claim 34, Straub teaches the method wherein taking action with respect to the locally-stored file associated with the file link comprises displaying an instance of the executable code. However, Straub does not explicitly disclose the instance to be an already-opened instance of the executable code. Official Notice is given that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that the selection of links to currently opened files brings the instance of that file to the top of the display. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to display an already-opened instance of a file in response to selection of the file link in order to conserve the memory used by the system.

9. Claims 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. ("Straub", US 5,905,492) in view of Hirose (US 5,745,112).

As per claim 42, Straub teaches the method further comprising:

maintaining information about a task that is available from an application program and displaying, according to the information about the task, a task link on the first page, the task link being associated with the task (col.5, lines 43-44; col.12, line 5).

However, Straub does not disclose taking action with respect to the task on the file associated with the file link, in response to a signal indicative of selection of the task link and a file link via the user interface. Hirose teaches a method of using a shell user interface for manipulating files whereby links to tasks and files are displayed and action is taking on the file according to the selected task (col.6, lines 40-65). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Hirose's teaching with Straub's method in order to provide a more convenient and faster means of performing an operation on a file.

Claim 43 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 44 is similar in scope to claim 23, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 45 is similar in scope to claim 42, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

10. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slivka et al. ("Slivka", US 6,061,695) in view of Dickman et al. ("Dickman", US 5,877,765).

As per claim 56, Slivka teaches in a computer system having a graphical user interface and a user interface selection device, a method of providing a menu on the user interface, comprising:

providing a shell user interface that enables the display of one or more pages (col.6, lines 4-5 and lines 20-21); and

Art Unit: 2174

making an option available while displaying each of a plurality of pages, the option being associated with a file system comprising a plurality of favorites folders (fig.3, favorites menu button 206; col.10, lines 65-67).

However, Slivka does not explicitly teach the steps wherein response to a signal indicative of a selection of the option when a first page is displayed in the shell user interface, writing information about the first page into a selected one of the favorites folders, displaying on a second page a link to the first page according to the information in the one favorites folder, and in response to a signal indicative of a selection of the link via the user interface, displaying the first page. Dickman teaches a method of providing a menu on a user interface wherein the menu provides an option for adding a page to a favorites folder and displaying the page in response to selecting the link to the added page (col.7, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Dickman's teaching with Slivka's method in order to provide a faster means of bookmarking frequently used pages for easier access.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Straub et al. (US 6,216,141) teaches a method of displaying links to remote and local files on a desktop.
- Brown et al. (US 6,278,448) teaches a method of creating a desktop that includes remote as well as local information.

Art Unit: 2174

Inquiries

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (703) 305-3989. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
November 29, 2002

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100